

New-York Daily Tribune

FRIDAY, AUGUST 1, 1862.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.
No notice can be taken of Anonymous Communications. Whenever a letter is intended for publication, it must be accompanied by the name and address of the writer—not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for its good faith. We cannot undertake to return rejected communications. All business letters for this office should be addressed to "THE TRIBUNE," New-York.

Among the Pine: Or, South in Secession Time.

The cheap edition of this very interesting volume on Southern life will be for sale at this office to-day at 12 o'clock. Price fifty cents.

NEWS OF THE DAY.

THE WAR.

—Let absentees from the army take notice that all furloughs are to expire on the 11th of August.

—Yesterday, R. R. Admiral Hiram Paulding raised the flag of his new rank at the Brooklyn Navy-Yard. At the same time orders were received to put two vessels in commission at once. Accordingly, the brig-of-war *Ramblende* and the steamer *Vixen* were turned over by the commandant of the station, and only declared commissioned men-of-war in the service of the United States. The new ironclad, *Unadilla*, now almost finished at Philadelphia, is to be commissioned and dispatched to sea with sealed orders on Saturday. Henceforth no unauthorized alien is to be employed in any Navy-Yard in the Union. All persons seeking employment must, before they are accepted, produce certificates of naturalization, properly authenticated. This order will result in the discharge of 6,000 men at the different stations.

—A singular story is in circulation, to the effect that ten iron-clad gunboats, built in England, and fully equipped, have opened Mobile harbor, and three more are on the way. These constitute the fleet ordered by the Southern Confederacy, and purchased in Europe. They mount from ten to thirty guns each, and are said to be mailed with Greenwich. The blockade was run up to the point of superior strength and weight of metal. Mobile is now considered open to the commerce of the world with the support of the newly-acquired power. This story is not credited at Washington.

—The rumors which filled the streets yesterday in regard to an important movement on the Peninsula, and that steamers had been ordered from this port to James River, arose from the fact that the authorities here had been directed to dispatch several vessels to Virginia for the conveyance of sick and wounded soldiers. Only four vessels were taken. Others, however, would also have been sent if they had been found suitable.

—We have four days later news from New-Orleans. There are no very important transactions to record. Gen. Butler seems to have got the right idea of guerrilla warfare. In consequence of outrages committed by Rebel marauders up the river, he has arrested some of their sympathizers and friends, and sent word to Traitor Van Dorn that the unscrupulous murderers must be given up or the traitor hostages shall swing.

—Collectors and assessors under the Tax law have been appointed for the States of Vermont, California, and Oregon, and for the Territories of Nevada, Washington, and Colorado. Major H. A. Goldsborough, appointed Collector for Washington Territory, will sail from New-York to-day, with commissions for the Collectors and Assessors on the Pacific coast.

—We have dates from Gen. McClellan's army up to yesterday. The health of the men was gradually improving. Steamers had gone up to City Point to bring away the remainder of our released prisoners. The story that a Rebel force had recently crossed the James River above Harpers Landing and drove off 600 head of cattle is pronounced entirely untrue.

—It is said that the Governors of Ohio and Iowa have been empowered to draft for the purpose of raising their share of the newly-called 300,000 men. Some of the George W. Jones and Vallandigham Rebel sympathizers may yet have a chance to do picket duty among the "born patriots" of the sacred soil.

—The United States steam gunboat *Wyandotté*, Commander W. D. Whiting, arrived at this port yesterday from Mosquito Inlet and Port Royal, sailing thence July 16, at 7 a. m. She came to this port for repairs, having been two months engaged blockading off Mosquito Inlet.

—The Iron Mountain Railroad Company of Missouri have donated \$500 to each new regiment now organized in the State, and ordered the dismissal of any employee who has involved the protection of any foreign Government to avoid military duty.

—On Tuesday last, Maj. Lazer, with 120 men of the 12th Missouri Regiment, attacked Maj. Fenley and Capt. Polson, with 180 Rebels, near Ballinger's Mills, killing ten and wounding many. A lot of horses, guns, &c., was captured. We did not lose a man.

—At Philadelphia, on Wednesday, from 400 to 500 Rebel prisoners confined at Fort Delaware took the oath of allegiance. The Louisiana Tigers seemed especially anxious to take the oath.

—The Hon. John S. Phelps, Senator from Missouri, and just appointed Military Governor of Arkansas, was at St. Louis on the 29th of July.

—A force of 127 Rebel guerrillas was routed at Sterling, Ky., a few days ago. Thirteen of them were killed, and 105 captured.

GENERAL NEWS.

—The contestants of City Railroads are determined to make their case sure; they have appealed from the decision of the General Term of the Supreme Court, and mean to get into the Court of Appeals if possible. The cases now stand thus: The Ninth-avenue Railroad is stayed from further proceedings toward finishing their road, in case the appeal is perfected, which will probably be done; if not, however, they will be at liberty to complete their road. The Seventh-avenue Company have the right to go on and construct their road without restriction.

—A Democratic State Convention was held in Indiana (at Indianapolis) yesterday, Thomas A. Hendricks presiding. The main feature of the affair was a speech by ex-Gov. Charles A. Wickliffe of Kentucky, in favor of hanging Abolitionists. "Birds of a feather," such as Voorhees, Richardson, and Carlisle, were present.

STATE OF THE MARKETS.

The Stock market opened steadily, without much life. There was no marked change in Government or State stocks, and Railways shares remained firm. Gold, on the first sale, was 144, and with gentle demand went to 144½, closing at that bid; and at 121 p. m. the Board, selling at 113. Railway mortgages, with accustomed firmness, had little business done in them. The market for Foreign Bills is dull, and lower. Good Sterling was sold at 122½, but at the close the market is firmer, and leading banking signatures are held at 120½. Freight is fairly active, and again firmer for breadstuffs to Great Britain, but otherwise the transactions are restricted. The business of the Sub-Treasury was, Re-

they had been the subjects of cruel treatment! No, they met in their chapels on the night of the 31st of July, and devoted the time to prayer and praise. A chorus of voices swelled the song of joyous expectation. When the hour of twelve approached, and the Cathedral clock began to strike, the entire mass in St. John's Church on the Island of Antigua fell upon their knees and received the boon of freedom in silence and in prayer. Every peal from the clock was the death-knell of Slavery, and when the last tone sounded, the lightning flashed and God's great bell of liberty, the sky, rang with peals of thunder. Then the mass arose shouting Glory Hallelujah, clapping their hands and clashing each other in their free arms, and leaping joyously with unfettered feet.

The 1st of August, then, as to-day, came on Friday. The holiday extended to Monday, and the time was devoted principally to worship. The testimony of planters, missionaries, teachers, magistrates, and emancipated negroes affords an unanswerable argument in favor of freedom; but we have space only for the argument of commerce, which is as follows, in official figures:

"CONSERVATIVE" PATRIOTISM.

They had a "Democratic" State Mass Convention at Indianapolis yesterday, and quite a full one. It was held to ratify and commend the State Ticket of the Bright-Vallandigham Democracy—a process whereof that ticket seemed to stand in great need. The crowd was gathered by assurances that John J. Crittenden, John S. Carlisle, Charles A. Wickliffe, Wm. A. Richardson, and other "Conservative" magnates should be present and speak. Mr. Crittenden concluded to stay away, but the three others named above were present, and Mr. Wickliffe made a "Conservative" speech, whereof the dispatch to the Associated Press gives the following synopsis:

"Gen. Wickliffe then addressed the Convention. He was for the Union, provided the rights of the South and Slavery were not interfered with. He was doing nothing more, but would wait and see what was to be done. If it is to be done, let it be done at another day of bloodshed. He would lead the leading Rebels, and balance the scale with the Abolitionists. The Abolitionists control every department of the Government, and were worse than the Rebels."

—There are nearly Seven Millions of Whites now engaged in a desperate attempt to destroy the Union—a tenth of them with arms in their hands. Some of these would be Unionists if they dare, but they dare not, so that is of little use. The Seven Millions hold in Slavery Three and a Half Millions of loyal persons, who cultivate their fields, grow their food, dig their trenches, and practically do half the work of the Rebellion. This Three and a Half Millions compose nearly all in the Rebel States who wish well to our cause. They welcome our soldiers wherever they dare, bring them intelligence of Rebel movements, positions and ambushes; they are our scouts, pilots, guides, without whom we could scarcely move in the Rebel country, and have often saved our troops from disastrous attacks and surprises. Had we from the first promised them freedom from their oppressors and our enemies, they would ere this have rendered ten, twenty, fifty times the aid they have done. We might long ago have had One Hundred Thousand of them working in our camps—drilling and fighting, too—if we only would. Yet "Gen. Wickliffe" gives us notice that, if we proffer freedom to these slaves of Rebels, he is against the Union cause evermore. Nay: he does not stop till he does something wrong hereafter: he denounces the Government at Washington as full of Abolitionists, whom he proposes to hang, banish, or send to the West, and meantime he pauses to ascertain that he is not helping Emancipation "before doing anything more." That is tolerably explicit.

We don't see what the Bright Democracy or even Bright himself, could have more to their mind. Of course, they cheered to the echo. The speech was exactly to their taste. That they should delight in such does by no means surprise us; but we do marvel a little when we hear this sort of people prate of their loyal and zealous support of the War for the Union. That is too cool for dog-days.

THE FIRST OF AUGUST AND EMANCIPATION.
With the first of August came the memories of West India Emancipation, when eight hundred thousand human beings obtained their freedom. Why did Great Britain abolish Slavery? Because the population returns from only eleven of the Colonies furnished the appalling fact that in the course of twelve years the slaves had decreased 60,919. The same rate of decrease continued for one hundred years would have brought about the abolition of Slavery by the extinction of the slaves. The production on the islands was also decreasing. In ten years ending in 1839 there was a decrease in the island of Jamaica of 201,843 hogsheads of sugar from the amount in population and production struck the death-blow of Slavery, and had more to do with emancipation than the arguments and appeals of Wilberforce.

Although the planters had the sugar market in their hands—a monopoly which cost the consumers \$25,000,000 annually; although they paid no wages to their workmen—gave them barely enough to eat to keep them in working condition—and furnished them with mere rags to about their loins—their perpetual pecuniary embarrassments compelled them to ask Parliament for assistance. Why were they reduced to this extremity? Because Slavery is like that species of serpent which secretes a poison for its own destruction. It contravenes the laws of nature: it takes away the motive power for toil; it makes the laborer indifferent to the waste of property; it stimulates a desire to steal by its privations; it destroys the spirit of invention, and keeps the negro in such ignorance that the star of moral and intellectual light cannot shine through the thick midnight of his condition. Its influence on the whites is equally disastrous. It encourages idleness and extravagance, out of which grow gambling, drunkenness, and licentiousness, and it makes labor degrading.

What has been the result of Emancipation? On the 1st of August, 1834, the slaves were liberated. Did they devote the day to intemperance excesses? Did they turn upon their former master and give blow for blow because

tholess, Lord Palmerston, in concluding the debate in the House, declared himself again expressly against any attempt of armed interference, declaring his concurrence with the opinion of Mr. Forster, that any such attempt would produce still greater suffering and disaster. He also denied the present condition of the Confederate States entitled them as much to recognition as the Republics of South America. Still he avowed the wish of the Government to assist in putting an end to the war, if the opportunity of doing so with success should present itself.

On the whole, we think the discussion in the House of Commons confirms, in every respect, the views expressed in former articles in THE TRIBUNE, that the English Government is determined to see the independence of the Southern Confederacy generally recognized, but does not think England to be at present in a position to incur on that account the risk of a war. As to the sympathies of the English people, as the speeches of both parties show, they will ultimately depend chiefly on the more or less Anti-Slavery character of our war; every step forward in an Anti-Slavery direction will increase, every step backward will diminish them.

THE NORTH AND THE SOUTH.

A LETTER TO JOHN L. O'SULLIVAN, ESQ.

(A Free-Seller of '63.)

Sir: A life-long political adversary, you ask me to publish for you three columns of bitter condemnation of our assailed and imperiled Federal Government, and dexterous, deliberate petting in behalf of the bloody treason which now threatens the life of our country. You ask this, knowing well that not one journal issued within the sphere of the Rebellion would dare publish such a defense of the Union cause and its champions as you volunteer in behalf of their deadly foes. But I dare print the most adroit and subtle plea that can be drawn up, even by you, for my country's assassin; for mine is the side of Light, of Truth, of Freedom. Standing opposed as I for years have done to the always despotic and now openly traitorous oligarchy whose cause you have espoused, I never asked anything better of them than to be met in the field of open and manly discussion—fact against fact, argument against argument; while their favorite logic has uniformly been a menacing exhibition of the bludgeon, the pistol, the rope, backed by assurances that they would make short work with me if I should ever venture within their power. At length, not satisfied with being ostentatiously and bitterly hostile to the great fundamental principle of our Republic—the Right of every rational, adult, inoffensive human being to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"—that oligarchy has rushed to arms against the American Union, and now threatens to crush into bloody ruin; and you require that the columns of THE TRIBUNE be given up to your skillful, elaborate plea in its behalf, and to your virtual justification of this gigantic and desolating Treason. Very well; I give you the required columns: Now bear my remembrance to your indictment of the Free North, her justice and her loyalty.

You say, Sir, that you hold the North more responsible than the South for Disunion, and you so impeach the North on three principal grounds:

1. Its Tariffs, by which it had long plundered; 2. Its Abolitionism, by which it had long oppressed; 3. Its refusal to acknowledge the rights of the South, by which it had once insulted and gravely annoyed her.

Let me meet your specifications in order:

I. You and I differ, and will doubtless continue to differ, with regard to the beneficence of Protective legislation. You deem it injurious to both North and South; I deem it equally beneficial to both. I believe Virginia has very much more to gain from such legislation than Massachusetts—that the "Old Dominion" has for a generation been dying out for want of a policy which should divert to the breeding of sheep and the fabrication of cloth from their fleeces that capital and attention which she has devoted to the detestable breeding of slaves for the cotton and sugar plantations of the fresher and more fertile South-West. I do not doubt the sincerity of your professed views on this point, nor could you doubt mine if you wished. I have long and deeply felt that your mistake was a very grave one, yet I have never wished to overrule it otherwise than by rational arguments and intelligent votes. Often beaten unfairly, by Plagiarism, frauds and fraudulent Naturalizations, those who hold with me have never dreamed of appealing from ballots to bullets. When temporarily overborne and defeated, we have renewed our demonstrations of the justice of our views, and patiently bided our time.

Now, whether you are right in the premises or I am, this truth is historically certain, that Protective Tariffs are not a device of the North to plunder the South. I know this, if I know nothing else with certainty, for I was induced by my strongly Protective views almost exclusively by Southern statesmen. I imbibed them from HENRY CLAY, born a Virginian and always a Southern; from HAZELIAH NILES, a Marylander; from JOHN C. CALHOUN, whose advocacy of Protection, both theoretical and practical, as leader of the House in settling our Tariff of 1816, was most thorough and controlling; and from ANDREW JACKSON, whose letter to Dr. Coleman in 1824 is the most radical and terse summary of the argument on that side that has ever yet appeared.

Virginia, through the mouth of her (nay, of our) great WASHINGTON (see Annual Message of 1790); through that of JEFFERSON (see Messages of 1802 and 1806); through several Messages of her MADISON, declared unequivocally for Protection. On the 7th of June, 1809, the House of Representatives

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to prepare and report to the House at their next session, a plan for the application of such duties as may be levied on the importation of the produce of the South, as to the power of the United States.

The Yeas and Nays being called on this proposition, the old Southern States voted as follows:

| | |
|-----------------------|-----|
| Yes. | No. |
| Virginia.....12 | 9 |
| North Carolina.....12 | 3 |
| South Carolina.....12 | 1 |
| Georgia.....12 | 1 |
| Florida.....12 | 1 |
| Total.....27 | 16 |

And so on the next motion to strike from the Tariff of 1816 the minimum valuation of twenty-five cents per square yard on Cotton fabrics—a provision which fixed for years the lowest

rate of duty on imported Cottons at six cents per square yard—Mr. Calhoun made a powerful speech against striking out, taking the most thoroughly Protective grounds, and six of the eight Members from South Carolina voted against striking out—one of them being of course Mr. Calhoun, and another the great and good WILLIAM LOWMEYER.

I need not pursue this history. Suffice it that, while Massachusetts and a majority of New-England opposed Protection down to a very late day—opposed even the Tariff of 1828, which Martin Van Buren and Simon Wright engineered through a Jackson Congress—the South did far more to inaugurate and establish the policy of Protection than the North. Mr. Webster's great Free-Trade speech in opposition to the Tariff of 1824 was the prayer of the Boston capitalists not to be forced to withdraw their capital from Commerce and invest it in Manufactures; but it was overruled.

For the fifteen years preceding Secession, there had been no Tariff in operation that the South did not fully concur in passing. She succeeded under a Tariff which had received the vote of every South Carolinian, every Free-Trader—a Tariff avowedly framed for revenue alone, and which did not afford revenue enough to maintain the Government in time of peace. The Morrill Tariff of 1861—though in my judgment a salutary and beneficent measure—could not have been passed but for the secession of the Cotton States. Was it not enough that the embryo traitors ran Breckinridge as a botching candidate for President on purpose to elect Lincoln, so as to make that election a pretext for Secession? Must you interpose a plea for Secession based on a Tariff that over its existence to that very Secession? Do you not remember Senator Hammond's triumphant answer to the complaint that the South had generally governed the country—"Have we not governed it well?" You, Mr. O'Sullivan, realize perfectly the truth of Gen. Jackson's remark in a letter to a Georgia friend just after the collapse of Nullification in 1833—"The Tariff was but a pretext. The next will be the Slavery or Negro question."

II. You charge that Abolitionism of the North has long "irritated" the South. I do not doubt it. Haman was irritated at seeing "Mordecai the Jew sitting in the King's gate." Herodians were "irritated" at the boldness of John the Baptist in saying to the great King Herod, "It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife." The Jewish priests, Pharisees and Sadducees, were "irritated" at seeing the multitude throwing palm branches in the path of Jesus and shouting "Hosanna to the son of David!" History is full of such irritations. The vital question lying behind this is "Have I not a right, as a citizen of a State which has tried Slavery and rejected it, to speak and act in the broad light of my intense conviction that Freedom is by far the wiser, juster, more humane, more beneficent? If a believer in bondage—say Tombs or Jeff. Davis—may lawfully seek and strive to strengthen, diffuse and aggrandize Slavery, may not I as lawfully and unexceptionally seek to weaken, restrict and overthrow it?" Until there is some show of reason why I may not, I must consider the case too plain for argument.

III. The last count in your indictment against the North charges with that "final sectionalization of our party politics, by which it had at once insulted and gravely annoyed the South." Here is something tangible. Let us consider it:

When Louisiana, sixty years ago, was bought by a Southern President with Fifteen Millions of our Public Money, adding immensely to the area and the strength of Slavery in our Union, nobody resisted that as a "sectionalization of our party politics." So when Florida was bought, more than forty years ago, under another Southern President, giving new expansion and security to Slavery on our Southern border, the South never regarded that as "sectionalization." But when the North, on the application of Missouri for admission as a State, by one spontaneous, unanimous outburst, said—"Messrs. Southerners! you have clutched the lion's share of these immense acquisitions—we will take this"—there arose one unanimous yell of abominable indignation and menace. "It is a heresid in the night," said Mr. Jefferson. "Admit Missouri as a Slave State or we will dissolve the Union!" shrieked the infuriated Slave Power. The North did not recoil, but a very few of her representatives did, and by their aid a compromise consigning Missouri to Slavery was forced through the House by the close vote of 20 to 87. That was a fatal precedent. It was the surrender of a majority to a bullying minority. When the North, thirty-five years later, came forward to claim the stipulated consideration for that surrender, the bargain was coolly repudiated. It was absurdly weak to expect anything else.

Louisiana, Missouri, Arkansas—three new Slave States—having been carved out of the Louisiana purchase and another secured in Florida, Slavery reached over into Mexico and clutched Texas. Having revolutionized and enslaved it, the next step was to annex it. "It will give a Gibraltar to the South," said Gen. James Hamilton, Jr., a South Carolina Nullifier, who was deep in the plot. Mr. Calhoun—frank, brave man that he always was—wrote officially as Secretary of State to Wm. R. King, our Minister at Paris, declaring that we needed Texas to strengthen Slavery at home—that, if we did not clutch it, British influence would prevail there and abolish "the peculiar institution"—that we must and would have it, in short.

This was kept secret till after the pending Presidential Election, but enough was known to excite and agitate the People of the Free States. As Mr. Webster had declared in Niblo's Garden in 1835, the question of Slavery Extension—any measure involving them in the responsibility of such Extension—touched the conscience of our people. "He must be a bold man," said Mr. W., "who is ready to brave the dictates of that conscience." Men of that stamp were found, however. Mr. Clay, the leader of the Whigs, their foreordained candidate for President, took decided ground against such Extension, in view of the existing

war between Mexico and her revolted province, though under other circumstances he would have been glad to see it effected. Mr. Van Buren, the designated candidate of the Democratic party, took ground against the project at least equally decided. At once, a "flank movement" was reached on. The negro-traders and blacklegs of the South resolved that Mr. Van Buren's nomination should be defeated, though a large majority of the delegates were pledged to support him. They surrounded, overshadowed, bullied the Convention, and juggled the candidate of the Democratic masses out of his nomination. James K. Polk, a fifth-rate Tennessee lawyer, but a facile tool of the Slave Power and fully committed to Annexation at all hazards, was nominated, and, by the help of two unfortunate letters from Mr. Clay and the perversity of a handful of Abolitionists, was elected. Promises were made to the Democratic masses that Annexation should nevertheless be resisted unless Free Labor should obtain an equal division of "the Spoils," but nothing came of them. When John P. Hale—then a Democratic Member of the House—proposed a division of Texas between Free and Slave Labor, and threatened in default of it to oppose Annexation, he was kicked out of the party, and his name taken off the Democratic Congress Ticket on the eve of the election. Annexation was forced through both Houses at the heel of the Session, and the slave-traders of Virginia, who had their expresses all ready, hurried them off to all the negro-breeding Counties with instructions to buy largely in advance of the general receipt of the news, and made a good thing of it.

Annexation led to war with Mexico. Everybody knew it would. In fact, Annexation was war with Mexico, as Messrs. Clay and Van Buren had long before demonstrated. Mexico was poor, weak, and easily overcome. It was soon evident that we should acquire still more territory of her on the conclusion of peace. The President asked Congress for \$3,000,000 wherewith to negotiate. The House voted it, with a proviso, moved by Mr. David Wilmot of Pa., that the territory so acquired, being now free, should be co-secrated to Free Labor. In other words, the rule which had given Texas to Slavery should be allowed to secure our further acquisitions to Freedom. This was no party measure. The mover was a Democrat, and every vote but three from the Free States was cast in the affirmative, though the House was strongly Democratic. Here was fair notice given that, as Slavery had clutched the whole of Texas, Freedom claimed the next slice and meant to insist on it. She has insisted. She is insisting to-day. That insisting is the pretext for the present Rebellion.

If, then, our politics have been sectionalized, it has been through the constant exertions and aggressions not of Freedom but of Slavery—not of the North, but of what calls itself the South.

I will not speak of the Kansas-Nebraska struggle, though I should be glad to. Suffice it that it was the same thing over again—Slavery insisting on new concessions; Freedom struggling to hold what was clearly her own. And she did hold it, no thanks to you or your party!

Only a word as to Cuba. That its acquisition has long been an object of keen abiding desire, and of Democratic diplomacy, all the world knows. The monstrous sum of One Hundred and Twenty Millions has been officially named as within the limit that we were ready to bid for it. Judge Rost, Confederate emissary at the Court of Madrid, stated the simple truth when he told the Spanish Minister, Caldeiro Colomates, that the South wanted it solely for political power—in order to make of it two or three new Slave States. The world remembers that memorable Ostend Conference, wherein our three Ambassadors at the principal Courts of Western Europe, James Buchanan, John Y. Mason and Pierre Soulé, met on purpose to issue a manifesto when Christianity at once reprobated as more shamelessly profligate and piratical than anything that had appeared since the Partition of Poland. Its purport briefly was—"We want Cuba; it is essential to us; we are willing to pay roundly for it; and if Spain shall ever undertake to abolish Slavery therein, we will take it at all hazards." That villainous manifesto presented us to Europe as a nation of highwaymen. When it reached one of the lesser Courts, our Ambassador there promptly branded it as a forgery; but it would not stay branded. We suffer in good name to-day because of it; but it made James Buchanan our last Democratic President. The poor old soul avowed his willingness, if he could acquire Cuba and put down Abolition, to die and let Breckinridge be President. If he awaits the consummation of his desires, he will live to be a good deal older than Methuselah.

If our politics have become "sectionalized," whose is the fault? I have given a rapid review of the essential facts. They need no comment. Unless, on the assumption that Slavery has an indefeasible right to grab and menace, and plunge us into war whenever she chooses to exert further aggrandizements, it cannot be denied that the South has been habitually the aggressor, while the North has stood on the defensive. Driven to the wall at last, the North determined to resist to the utmost the further Extension of Slavery. Hence the present Civil War.

In another letter, I will consider your special pleas for the disunion traitors.

Yours,
HOLMES ORMSLEY.
New-York, July 21, 1862.

We learn, on authority which we deem trustworthy, that a bulletin almost word for word the same as that published in England on the arrival of the Glasgow, was posted in the books of the Exchange Reading-Room, at Baltimore, on the 4th and 5th of July. The entry, it was found, was afterward removed, so that our informant cannot recall the exact date. The agent of the reading-room, Geo. A. Porter, was subsequently arrested, and is now, we believe, in confinement. If the statement be true, and we have no reason to doubt it, he had its origin on this side the ocean, though it was probably intended for the English market.